EXHIBIT G

TRANSCRIPT EXCERPT

	Page 1
1	
2	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
3	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
4	Case No. 11-10789-REG
5	x
6	In the Matter of:
7	
8	KOREA LINE CORPORATION,
9	
10	Debtor.
11	
12	x
13	
14	U.S. Bankruptcy Court
15	One Bowling Green
16	New York, New York
17	March 14, 2011
18	2:03 PM
19	
20	B E F O R E:
21	HON. ROBERT E. GERBER
22	U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE
23	
24	
25	

							Page 2
1							
2	HEARING	re	Doc	#7	on	Preliminary	Injunction
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25	Transcri	bec	l by:	: I	Pnin	a Eilberg	

Page 3 1 2 APPEARANCES: 3 HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP Attorneys for Korea Line 4 5 31 West 52nd Street New York, NY 10019 6 7 8 BY: BARBARA R. PARLIN, ESQ. 9 WARREN E. GLUCK, ESQ. 10 JAMES H. POWER, ESQ. 11 12 13 CHALOS & CO. P.C. 14 Attorneys for Banca Antonventa 15 123 South Street 16 Oyster Bay, NY 11771 17 18 BY: GEORGE M. CHALOS, ESQ. 19 KERRI M. D'AMBROSIO 20 21 22 23 24 25

		Exhibiting 4 horiginal 5 of /
		Page 4
1		
2	BROWN	GAVALAS & FROMM LLP
3		Attorneys for Asian Friendship
4		355 Lexington Avenue
5		New York, NY 10017
6		
7	BY:	PETER SKOUFALOS, ESQ.
8		
9		
10	BLANK	ROME LLP
11		Attorneys for Oldendorff Carriers
12		The Chrysler Building
13		405 Lexington Avenue
14		New York, NY 10174
15		
16	BY:	JEREMY J.O. HARWOOD, ESQ.
17		
18		
19	SEWARD	0 & KISSEL LLP
20		One Battery Park Plaza
21		New York, NY 10004
22		
23	BY:	BRUCE G. PAULSEN, ESQ.
2 4		JOHN R. ASHMEAD, ESQ.
25		

		Page 5
1		
2	WATSON, FARLEY & WILLIAMS LLP	
3	1133 Avenue of the Americas	
4	New York, NY 10036	
5		
6	BY: NEIL A. QUARTARO, ESQ.	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Page 36

on the date that the Chapter 15 case cannot, by any action that I could legitimately permit, become a secured creditor thereafter. The most obvious thing, therefore, that needs to be blocked is Rule Ds but it's not that alone.

As I also indicated in colloquy earlier, the kinds of things that a judge in my position must protect the estate against are not just grabbing of the asset to take ownership of it or to take lien of it, such as a ship, but also to interfere with it in other ways, that's the teaching of the Second Circuit's decision in 48th Street Steakhouse. It doesn't matter whether the vessel is owned by Korea Lines, is being rented or chartered by Korea Lines or is being operated in some other capacity by Korea Lines. In any one of those variants I have to protect the petitioners from anything within the United States that interferes with that.

Now, I said within the United States because I remain of the view that at least in Chapter 15 cases our job is to protect against interference within the United States and I have material reservations as to my power to be an international watchdog elsewhere. I noted that the English court did what my tentative would certainly be, which is to protect against proceedings within its own jurisdiction and I think it even expressly stated, in baby talk, that it wasn't intending to act extra-territorially.

Now I do not accept either side's view as to who wins